



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,251	07/15/2005	Sang-Zee Lee	34381-1	2719

24256 7590 06/16/2006  
DINSMORE & SHOHL, LLP  
1900 CHEMED CENTER  
255 EAST FIFTH STREET  
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THU V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3661

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/542,251	LEE, SANG-ZEE	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thu Nguyen	3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 July 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The response to the restriction requirement filed on march 27, 2006 has been entered. By this response, the invention group I (including claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-13) has been elected without traverse, accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-6, and 8-13 are examined in this office action.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2, 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. In claim 2, line 11, the claimed "the terminal" is ambiguous. There are several different terminals stated in the claims 1 and 2, it is not clear which terminal among the terminals disclosed in claim 1, line 5, 10, 16 or in claim 2, line 5, 8, etc. the claimed terminal in claim 2, line 11 refers to.
- b. Claim 3, line 7 (non-elected claim), the claimed "the wired or wireless internet terminal" is provisionally rejected (in case restriction is withdrawn) as ambiguous as explained in claim 2 above
- c. Other claims are rejected as being dependent on the rejected base claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 3661

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al (US 2004/0181559).

As per claim 1, Lee teaches a location information sharing method. The method includes: registering location information including the location coordinate and a location ID (para 0022); searching the registered location information corresponding to the location ID (para 0055); transmitting location information from a domain server to the requesting internet terminal (para 0057); automatically performing various application functions (para 0054). Lee does not explicitly disclose storing and managing the location information using the location ID received from other terminals. However, Lee teaches allowing a user who wants to search for location information to connect to the location domain server (para 0047, 0037), Lee obviously encompasses teaching storing and managing the location information using the ID from other terminals when the user terminal is considered as other terminal, the user terminal (viewed as other terminal) can manage the location information by using edit function (para 0025). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow a terminal to register and retrieve location information while allowing other terminal to store or manage the location information in order to allow the users from different terminals to access and manage information stored in the server when the location ID is known to the terminals.

As per claim 2, Lee teaches inputting the location ID, selecting the received location ID to request the location information (para 0030-0032); connecting the terminal to the corresponding domain server (para 0034, 0047) and transmitting the search location information to the requesting terminal (para 0055). Moreover, transmitting information from one terminal to other terminal would have been well known and obvious matter of design choice in order to allow the other terminal to share and use the information entered by the host terminal.

As per claim 4-5, Lee teaches the capability of sharing information (para 0036-0037, 0059-0060), and including map coordinate information (para 0052). Further, indicating location of the search location information on an electronic map and performing navigation taking the available location information as destination when the location coordinate is available would have been well known.

As per claim 6, Lee teaches transmitting an error code message (para 0043). Moreover, generating error when there is an abnormality in the search would have been well known.

As per claim 8, Lee teaches inputting location coordinate and location ID (para 0022, 0036); connecting the location information server and checking whether the location ID is duplicated and register the location ID if not duplicated (para 0053).

Art Unit: 3661

As per claim 9-10, using location information from GPS as present location coordinates, or using information entered as an address, a trade name, etc. would have been well known.

As per claim 11, Lee teaches a location ID formed by combination of a point identification of each location (para 0052, 0023).

As per claim 12, Lee teaches the location Id symbol of # (para 0052, 0023).

As per claim 13, connecting to the servers via internet using terminal such as computers, cell phone, etc. would have been well known.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant asserts that the amended independent claim should include species 2. However, the added limitation is stated as alternative “or”, this alternative allows interpreting claim 1 in alternative format in which the written document could be ignore when its alternative is found. Claim 1, therefore, does not actually include species 2.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6967. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (7:30-6:00).

Art Unit: 3661

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

June 12, 2006

  
**THU V. NGUYEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**